

Amendment – Ser. No. 10/758,474
March 6, 2006
Page 6

REMARKS


In the Ray document, the hinge is locked onto the oven by pivoting the locking arm to its locked position, where the locking arm 24 blocks the hanger channel 72 to capture the pin 74 in the channel 72. *Nothing in Ray discloses or even suggests that the locking arm 24 contacts an upper edge of the mounting opening.* The locking feature is provided solely by the fact that the locking arm 24 blocks the channel 72 of the hanger 22 to capture the pin 74 in the channel, and this is clear with reference to the Ray documents, e.g., at col. 4, lines 35-44.

In the present application, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify that the latch K does not obstruct either of the first and second slots S1, S2 of the claw C. This is exactly the opposite of the Ray document, which relies solely on obstructing the channel 72 of the hanger 22 to capture the pin 74. In the present application, the latch K *never acts on or captures the pin M3 of the mounting receptacle*. Instead, as recited in claims 1 and 10, the latch acts on the upper edge of the opening of the mounting receptacle. As such, the Ray document teaches directly away from the structure recited in amended claims 1 and 10, and amended claims 1 and 10 are submitted to provide a novel and unobvious alternative to the structure of the Ray document given the entirely different solution.

In light of the foregoing amendments and comments, claims 1 and 10 and their respective independent claims are respectfully submitted to define over Ray et al. and the other documents of record. This application is submitted to meet all statutory requirements, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP



Steven M. Haas (Reg. No. 37,841)
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

March 6, 2006
Date